



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/065,745	11/14/2002	Nenad Rijavec	BLD920020007	7517	
56989	7590 04/26/2006		EXAMINER		
LAW OFFICE OF CHARLES W. PETERSON, JR PRINTERS 11703 BOWMAN GREEN DR.			HUNTSINGER, PETER K		
SUITE 100	IAN GREEN DR.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
RESTON, VA 20190			2625	<del></del>	
			DATE MAILED: 04/26/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/065,745	RIJAVEC, NENAD	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Peter K. Huntsinger	2625	

	Peter K. Huntsinger	2625					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 10 April 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff stice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
NOTICE OF APPEAL		<b></b>					
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th					
<del></del>	but prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered b	0001100				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);							
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ected claims.					
<u> </u>		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324)				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s).</li> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>							
7. Tor purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.							
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		- 1					
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fai	ils to provide a				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	•		·				
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	at does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:				
12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)					
13.	K-17-P						
KING Y POON							

KING Y. POON PRIMARY EXAMINER

Application No. 10/065,745

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant argues on pages 6-8 of the response in essence that:

The instruction operator 114 of Barry et al. is not networked with the RIP engines.

Barry et al. disclose an instruction operator which communicates with a plurality of RIP engines (col. 4, lines 34-40). These components can be considered networked because the instruction operator is able to direct information to the RIP engines. This is similar to two computers that are connected to the internet however they are not directly connected to each other. Further, the definition within the art of network is defined as a group or system of electric components and connecting circuitry designed to function in a specific manner. The instruction operator is in the same system as the RIP engines and is considered networked.